

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the telephonic interview on March 7, 2005. In the interview, the undersigned asked about claim 55, which was not allowed, withdrawn or rejected. In addition, the undersigned briefly described the invention and how it differed from the prior art. Particularly, that the present invention illuminated a housing via a light system disposed inside the housing and that *Laurikka* discloses electronic inks, which is not associated with light systems at all. In addition, that *Bayramoglu* is directed at bezel buttons, and only mentioned using an LED as an indicator at the surface of the front bezel. The LED in *Bayramoglu* however does not illuminate the housing. The Examiner indicated that *Laurikka* describes a light system at Col. 6, lines 45-56. This particular section describes (in an unclear manner) using light emitting polymers (LEPs). No agreement was reached in the interview.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20, 22-26, 28-33 under 35 USC 102 and claims 1-19, 21, 27, 34-54 under 35 USC 103. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 10, 20, 21, 32 and 39 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-55 are pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 20, 22-26 and 28-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Laurikka et al* (6,508,996).

In contrast to *Laurikka*, claim 20 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...sampling a plurality of regions of the screen display to acquire color indicators for the plurality of regions... changing the color of one or more regions of the housing based on the color indicators of one or more sampled regions of the screen display." While *Laurikka* may disclose setting the color of the display to a different one, nowhere does *Laurikka* state that the color change of the cover is based on the current color of the display. This cannot be construed from Col. 6 lines 1-10. All that is stated in that paragraph is that the display, antenna and keyboard can change color by means of a control signal in a manner similar to the color change of the cover. *Laurikka* does not describe sampling the color of the display and changing the color of the cover based on the

color of the display. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner is urged to review the description and Figs. 11 – 17 of the present invention to get a better understanding of this particular claim. Figs 14-17 show several examples of sampling regions of a screen display and changing color of the housing based on the color of the screen display. Particularly, extending the feel of the display to the housing that surrounds the display. This simply is not taught in *Laurikka*.

Similar arguments can be made for claim 32. Claim 32 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...determining color indicators for a plurality of regions on the screen display that are associated with the illuminable zones... illuminating the illuminable zones of the housing based on the color indicators of the regions associated therewith... the illumination colorizing the illuminable zone of the housing in conjunction with the color of the associated region." Furthermore, *Laurikka* is completely silent to regional dependency or associating portions of a housing to portions of a display. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

With regards to paragraph 11 in the Office Action, the Examiner disagreed with the Applicants argument that *Laurikka* does not teach or suggest sampling a plurality of regions of the screen display. In support of this, the Examiner referenced Col. 4, lines 45-48, 52-58 and 64-66. While these sections may teach forming patterns on the cover and utilizing the cover as an indicator, none of these sections teach or suggest changing the color of the cover based on the color of the display (which is the result of sampling). The most that can be said is that both the cover and the battery icon act as indicators and that they may be controlled via control signals as for example when the battery is weak. This however is not (emphasis added) changing the color of the cover based on the color of the display. *Laurikka* only states that the cover can act as an indicator of battery strength, and only shows that the display area includes a battery icon (which may or may not be part of the displayed information of the display). Furthermore, nowhere does it suggest that the battery icon changes color as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

It is the Applicants belief that the Examiner has used hindsight reconstruction of *Laurikka* with the Applicants own disclosure as a blueprint to recreate the invention from

indirect teachings in *Laurikka*. If the Examiner did not have the Applicants invention in front of him, there is no way that he (or anyone skilled in the art) would have come up with the claimed invention from the teachings in *Laurikka*. The sections relied upon by the Examiner are just not related to the limitations of the claim.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 22-26, 28-31 and 33 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons as above, it should be noted that they offer additional language that is unsupported by the art.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1-19, 34-48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bayramoglu et al.* (6,289,466) in view of *Laurikka et al* (6,508,996).

In contrast to both references, claim 1 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...a housing containing said microprocessor, said data storage device, and said light system therein, wherein said light system provides said housing with a dynamic ornamental appearance." While *Bayramoglu* may disclose an LED, *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest an LED contained within the front bezel. In *Bayramoglu*, the LEDs are located on the front bezel (see last line of abstract). Without further evidence, something located "on" the front bezel cannot be considered internal or contained within the front bezel. *Laurikka* does not overcome the deficiencies of *Bayramoglu*. While *Laurikka* may disclose LEPs, *Laurikka* does not teach or suggest disposing the LEPs inside the cover. In fact, *Laurikka* teaches away from such embodiments when he states, "the cover 1 of the wireless communication device 7, whose colour can be changed by means of control signals can be implemented by arranging an element similar to the display element used in computers on top of the cover of the wireless communication device (Col. 6, lines 45-49)." Something "on top" cannot be considered contained within the cover. The term "on top" implies that the element is externally located rather than internal located relative to the cover. Neither reference discloses an internal light system and thus the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to both references, claim 10 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "...emitting light in accordance with the computer system events, the light being directed towards the housing; and illuminating at least a non-insignificant portion of the housing of the

general purpose computer system with the emitted light.” Neither reference teaches or suggests illuminating a non-insignificant portion of the housing of the general purpose computer system with the emitted light and therefore the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

In contrast to both references, claim 34 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...sampling regions of the screen display to acquire color indicators...” As mentioned above *Laurikka* does not teach or suggest sampling regions of a display. The most that can be said is that *Laurikka* teaches changing the color of a cover and changing the color of a display. *Laurikka*, however, does not suggest changing the color of the cover based on the color of the display. *Bayramoglu* does not overcome these deficiencies. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to both references, claim 39 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...internal light elements ...” Neither reference teaches or suggests lights internal to the cover or the bezel. As mentioned above, *Laurikka* states, “arranging an element similar to the display element used in computers on top of the cover of the wireless communication device (Col., 6, lines 45-49)” and *Bayramoglu* states, “LEDs on the front bezel (Abstract).” Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to both references, claim 43 (and its dependents) specifically requires, “...an illuminable housing...a light arrangement...disposed in said housing, said light arrangement being configured to illuminate said illuminable housing so as to dynamically change the ornamental appearance of said housing...” Again, *Bayramoglu* discloses “LEDs on a front bezel” and *Laurikka* discloses “elements on top of the cover” Neither reference teaches or suggests a light arrangement disposed inside the bezel or the cover. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 2-9, 11-19, 35-38, 40-42, and 44-48 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons as above, it should be noted that they offer additional language that is unsupported by the art.

Claims 21, 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Laurikka et al (6,508,996)* in view of *Bayramoglu et al. (6,289,466)*.

In contrast to both references, claim 21 specifically requires, "...the computing device includes a plurality of light elements within the housing of the computing device..." Again, *Laurikka* does not teach or suggest illumination that comes from within the cover or illumination that illuminates the cover. And while *Bayramoglu* may disclose LEDs, these LEDs are not located within the housing and do not illuminate the housing. See also arguments made above. Accordingly, the rejections are unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Also in contrast to both references, claim 27 specifically requires, "wherein each of the light elements comprises a plurality of different colored Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs)." *Laurikka* is silent to LEDs. And while *Bayramoglu* may disclose LEDs, *Bayramoglu* does not teach or suggest light elements with a plurality of LEDs or different colored LEDs. In *Bayramoglu*, each of the LEDs sits by itself separated from other LEDs. See Fig. 2. Furthermore, *Bayramoglu* makes no mention of different colored LEDs. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 49-54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bayramoglu et al. (6,289,466)* in view of *Laurikka et al (6,508,996)* and further in view of *McDonough et al. (6,486,873)*.

The combination of *McDonough* does not cure the deficiencies of *Bayramoglu* and *Laurikka*. In contrast to all the references, claim 49 (and its dependents) specifically requires, "wherein the computer system further includes a second computer device, the second computer device including a second computer component and a second illuminable housing." It appears the Examiner is relying on *McDonough* for the second computer device, but as shown above *Bayramoglu* and *Laurikka* do not form a first device. Therefore the claim limitations are not met. Accordingly, the rejection is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Although the rejections to the dependent claims 50-54 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons as above, it should be noted that they offer additional language that is unsupported by the art.

SUMMARY

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Quin C. Hoellwarth, REG. #32,947
for Quin C. Hoellwarth
Reg. No. 45,738

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300